

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

SEP 15 2006

Remarks/Arguments:

This is a reply to the office action of June 15, 2006.

The examiner's criticisms of the specification and drawings were well taken. We have amended the specification to define the driving pieces 37 as first driving pieces and to define the driving pieces 45 and 65 as second driving pieces. We have also amended Fig. 4 by adding reference numeral 3 to indicate the bolt member. This change is supported at paragraphs 0052 - 0053. No new matter has been introduced.

Claims 1 - 20 were rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph on the ground that "it is not clear which structure of the drawings for example correspond to the claimed 'door lock structure' whereby the scope and meaning is not clear". We respectfully traverse this rejection, with the following explanation.

As described at paragraph 0046, the present invention can be applied to conventional fire-blocking doors without changing the structure of such fire-blocking doors. Therefore, the description of the claimed door lock structure can be simplified based on the fire-blocking door 100 of the prior art. In addition, as described in paragraph 0046, the actuation mechanism inside the door lock structure, as recited in claim 1, is formed by the two rotating blocks 27, the draft bar 28, the slide support 31, and the latch block 33 of the door latch device shown in Figs. 1, 5, 8 and 10. We submit that the claims clearly describe this structure.

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of claim 2, now canceled. In view of the examiner's indication of allowability of the subject matter of claim 2, we believe that all the claims now patentably distinguish the invention from the prior art, and that this application is in proper form for allowance.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

SEP 15 2006

Respectfully submitted,

Charles Fallow

Charles W. Fallow
Reg. No. 28,946

Shoemaker and Mattare, Ltd.
10 Post Office Road
Silver Spring, MD 20910
(301) 589-8900